

Note on the Spin-Spin Relaxation Time in High- T_c Cuprate Superconductors¹

O. Narikiyo

Department of Physics, Kyushu University, Fukuoka 810-8560, Japan
(November, 2000)

Recent experiments on the spin-spin relaxation time in high- T_c cuprate superconductors are discussed on the basis of the BCS-RPA theory.

Keywords: spin-spin relaxation time, high- T_c cuprate superconductor

The temperature dependence of the spin-spin relaxation time recently measured in high- T_c cuprate superconductors [2–5] deviates from the expected behavior of a prevailing theory. [6] The observed relaxation time has strong temperature dependence for temperatures below the superconducting transition temperature, $T < T_c$, while the theory predicts little temperature dependence. Such a temperature independence predicted by the theory was regarded as an evidence for the d -wave superconductivity and established by the measurements in La- and Y-systems. [7] On the other hand, the measurements in Tl-, Hg- and Bi-systems [2–5] revealed the insufficiency of the theory. [6]

In this Short Note we clarify that the temperature independence is not a direct consequence of the theory by searching much wider parameter space than in the original work [6] and that the recent experiments [2–5] can be understood within the framework of the theory.

The Gaussian component of the spin-spin relaxation time T_G is expressed as

$$\frac{T_G(T_c)}{T_G(T)} = \left[\frac{R(T)}{R(T_c)} \right]^{1/2}, \quad (1)$$

using

$$R(T) = \sum_{\mathbf{q}} F^4(\mathbf{q}) \chi^2(\mathbf{q}) - \left[\sum_{\mathbf{q}} F^2(\mathbf{q}) \chi(\mathbf{q}) \right]^2. \quad (2)$$

Here $\chi(\mathbf{q})$ is the static spin susceptibility and $F(\mathbf{q})$ is the form factor.

The static spin susceptibility is given by the BCS-RPA theory [6] as

$$\chi(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{\chi_0(\mathbf{q})}{1 - U\chi_0(\mathbf{q})}, \quad (3)$$

with

$$\chi_0(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{p}} \left[C_+(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \frac{f(E_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q}}) - f(E_{\mathbf{p}})}{E_{\mathbf{p}} - E_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q}}} + C_-(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \frac{f(-E_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q}}) - f(E_{\mathbf{p}})}{E_{\mathbf{p}} + E_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q}}} \right], \quad (4)$$

where U is the parameter for the on-site Coulomb interaction and $f(E)$ is the Fermi distribution function. The energy for the BCS quasiparticle is given by

$$E_{\mathbf{p}} = \sqrt{\varepsilon_{\mathbf{p}}^2 + \Delta_{\mathbf{p}}^2}, \quad (5)$$

with

$$\varepsilon_{\mathbf{p}} = -2t[\cos(p_x a) + \cos(p_y a)] - 4t' \cos(p_x a) \cos(p_y a) - 2t''[\cos(2p_x a) + \cos(2p_y a)] - \mu, \quad (6)$$

where t , t' , t'' is the hopping parameter and μ is the chemical potential and

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{p}} = \frac{\Delta_0(T)}{2} [\cos(p_x a) - \cos(p_y a)], \quad (7)$$

where $\Delta_0(T)$ is the gap function in the BCS theory. Here we consider a tight-binding model on the square lattice of the lattice constant a . The coherence factor is given by

$$C_{\pm}(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 \pm \frac{\varepsilon_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q}} \varepsilon_{\mathbf{p}} + \Delta_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q}} \Delta_{\mathbf{p}}}{E_{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{q}} E_{\mathbf{p}}} \right]. \quad (8)$$

The form factor is given by

$$F(\mathbf{q}) = A_{cc} + 2B[\cos(q_x a) + \cos(q_y a)], \quad (9)$$

in the present two-dimensional tight-binding model.

We have done numerical calculations with above formulae. The parameters are fixed as $t'/t = -1/6$, $t''/t = 1/5$, $\mu/t = -1$, $T_c/t = 0.1$ and $U/t = 3$. The temperature dependence of the chemical potential μ has been neglected. The choice of $T_c/t = 0.1$ is in accordance with ref. 5 and $U/t = 3$ is consistent with ref. 7. Our main results have been checked to be insensitive to the choice of the values of t' and t'' .

First, in Fig. 1(a), we have examined the temperature dependence of the static spin susceptibility. The susceptibility is strongly temperature dependent around $\mathbf{q} = (0, 0)$ and weakly dependent around $\mathbf{q} = (\pi/a, \pi/a)$. The latter reflects the fact that the existence of the d -wave superconductivity does not conflict with the antiferromagnetic long-range correlation.

Since the form factor is fixed as $A_{cc} = -4B$ in ref. 5, the temperature dependence of T_G is predominantly determined by that of $\chi(\mathbf{q})$ around $\mathbf{q} = (\pi/a, \pi/a)$. Namely, the contribution from the region around $\mathbf{q} = (0, 0)$ is masked by the form factor so that T_G has little temperature dependence. Such a choice is consistent with the data for La- and Y-systems. For example, $A_{cc}/B = -177/44$ in $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_4\text{O}_8$. [9]

On the other hand, the masking is absent in other cuprate superconductors. For example, $A_{cc}/B = -170/100$ in $\text{Tl}_2\text{Ba}_2\text{CuO}_6$ [9] and the numerical result for T_G with this value in Fig. 1(c) has substantial temperature dependence. The 15% reduction at the lowest temperature is twice of the reduction in the theory of ref. 5 and consistent with the experiment. [2]

It can be said that we have substantial temperature dependence if the masking is absent. However, the temperature dependence observed in Hg- and Bi-systems [3–5] is much stronger than obtained in Fig. 1(c). As seen in Fig. 1(b) where $A_{cc}/B = -170/100$, the shorter the coherence length of the superconductivity, the stronger the temperature dependence is. Although more elaborate treatment is needed for the short coherence-length (strong coupling) case, the qualitative feature can be captured by the present parameter extrapolation. In ref. 5 the parameter has been fixed as $2\Delta_0(0)/k_B T_c = 3.52$ of the weak coupling value. Thus it can be said that we have a strong temperature dependence if the coherence length is short. Actually in the numerical result with parameters appropriate for Bi-system of Fig. 1(d), we have a strong temperature dependence as commented in ref. 4.

In summary, the temperature dependence of the spin-spin relaxation time observed by recent experiments can be understood within the BCS-RPA theory, if the coherence length of the superconductivity is short and the masking due to the form factor is absent. Such a conclusion is easily understood by taking account of the fact [10] that the BCS susceptibility $\chi_0(\mathbf{q})$ is suppressed by the Cooper pair (singlet) formation for $|\mathbf{q}| < \xi^{-1}$ where ξ is the coherence length for the superconductivity (the size of the Cooper pair).

Since our calculation is based on the mean-field approximation, it can not directly fit experimental data and will be modified if fluctuations are taken into account. The superconducting transition temperature T_c in the present theory corresponds to the temperature giving the maximum of $1/T_G$ in experiments and is higher than experimentally observed T_c . The steep decrease of $1/T_G$ around $T = T_c$ in the theory will become gentle due to fluctuations.

As noted in ref. 4, the on-set temperature for the decrease of $1/T_G$ due to superconducting fluctuations in experiments is lower than the so-called pseudogap temperature observed by the spin-lattice relaxation time of the NMR and the ARPES experiments. The on-set temperature seems to correspond to the temperature giving the maximum of the Hall coefficient [11,12] and this maximum temperature can be interpreted as the on-set temperature for superconducting fluctuations, since the collective contribution of superconducting fluctuations to the Hall coefficient has opposite sign to that of spin fluctuations dominant at higher temperatures. [13]

The author is grateful to Kenji Ishida for valuable discussions on various NMR experiments.

-
- [1] This paper has been submitted to the Short Note section of J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.
 - [2] Y. Itoh, H. Yasuoka, A. Hayashi and Y. Ueda: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **63** (1994) 22.
 - [3] Y. Itoh, T. Machi, A. Fukuoka, K. Tanabe and H. Yasuoka: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **65** (1996) 3751.
 - [4] Y. Itoh, A. Tokiwa-Yamamoto, T. Machi and K. Tanabe: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **67** (1998) 2212.
 - [5] Y. Tokunaga, K. Ishida, K. Yoshida, T. Mito, Y. Kitaoka, Y. Nakayama, J. Shimoyama, K. Kishio, O. Narikiyo and K. Miyake: Physica B **284-288** (2000) 663.
 - [6] N. Bulut and D. J. Scalapino: Phys. Rev. Lett. **67** (1991) 2898.
 - [7] Y. Itoh, K. Yoshimura, T. Ohomura, H. Yasuoka, Y. Ueda and K. Kosuge: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **63** (1994) 1455.
 - [8] Y. Itoh: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **64** (1995) 222.
 - [9] Y. Itoh and H. Yasuoka: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **63** (1994) 2518.
 - [10] N. Bulut and D.J. Scalapino: Phys. Rev. B **45** (1992) 2371.
 - [11] J. M. Harris, Y. F. Yan and N. P. Ong: Phys. Rev. B **46** (1992) 14293.
 - [12] J. M. Harris, H. Wu, N. P. Ong, R. L. Meng and C. W. Chu: Phys. Rev. B **50** (1994) 3246.
 - [13] O. Narikiyo: preprint (cond-mat/0006028).

